

the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon to inform this body that, for the first time in the history of the United States, our country has been found guilty of a major human rights violation.

The Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States, a body in which we proudly participate, a body which we helped to finance, has made public its finding today after an 11-year investigation. I would like to quote what the Commission found.

"The commission concludes that the State," meaning the United States, "has failed to justify the denials of the petitioners of the effective representation in their Federal Government and, consequently, that the petitioners have been denied an effective right to participate in their government, directly or through freely chosen representatives and in general conditions of equality, contrary to Articles XX and II of the American Declaration" of rights of man.

The Commission was referring to the denial of voting representation in the Congress of the United States to the residents of the capital of the United States who are second per capita in the Federal income taxes they pay to support their government and who have fought and died in every war, fought and died, since the Revolutionary War, since the establishment of our government.

This ruling comes at a very important time in our history because we have not only declared that democracy and democratic principles must be universal, we have invaded another country. We are, as I speak, around the world proclaiming that each and every government must give full democracy, equal democracy to all the people of that government.

This government does not do that for the people of the District of Columbia, and an international body for the first time has so found. The international body, the Commission on Human Rights of the OAS, enjoys great prestige. We cannot say that this is not a body that does not enjoy our respect, and it is a body in which we have proudly participated.

The United States defended fully, and its defense was found wanting. We have every reason to desire the full confidence of the world. We need the world with us as we fight against terrorists bent on destroying us. We have lost much of that confidence because of the

invasion of Iraq. We have rallied around our troops in Iraq and around our country because our country is at war. But our country now needs the world more than the world needs our country.

I cannot imagine anything that would go further to restore the waning confidence of the world in our leadership then for the Congress, for the administration to reach out and say to the people who live here, you are entitled to no fewer rights than any other American citizens.

Even as our country decided when I was a child going to segregated schools in the Nation's capital, no less that we could apply our own self-corrective and, indeed, integrate those schools and declare discriminatory practice off limits in our country, so we can take this last remaining scar on our democracy and wipe it from us. We simply must do it now.

The shame of having a violation of human rights declared upon us even as we have a long list of violators that we publish every year cannot be long-standing. This country has always stepped up to correct its own problems. This is a problem that stares in the face of the Congress of the United States every day that we open for business and meet because the 600,000 people who live here do not have a vote on this floor and have no senators who represent them.

□ 1715

This country, our people would not stand for this anywhere in the world; and if I may say so, our people do not stand for it now. Polls show they do not even know it, that the American people think that the people who live in their Nation's capital have the same rights that they do. Shame on us that they do not.

I ask the Congress of the United States to, in fact, adhere to the decision of the Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States and grant full and equal voting rights in the Congress of the United States to the people of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SOUDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE NON-NEGOTIATION CLAUSE IN THE MEDICARE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard since the passage of the Prescription Drug and Medicare Modernization Act that this law is a Republican giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry. Why, or maybe more importantly, who is telling American seniors this important legislation is bad for them but good for the drug companies? In this election year, it seems that some individuals are using disingenuous political rhetoric to scare our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss one provision in the bill that is called out as the "drug company giveaway." There is a clause in the legislation that directly states, "Noninterference. In order to promote competition under this part and in carrying out this part, the Secretary may not interfere with the negotiations between drug manufacturers and pharmacies and prescription drug plan sponsors; and may not require a particular formulary or institute a price structure for the reimbursement of covered drugs under part D."

Simple enough, right? The government cannot interfere with negotiations between private entities and cannot set price controls. The marketplace, free enterprise, will set the price of prescription drugs and do a much better job of driving down prices than some government bureaucrat.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new idea. This language has been used in the same context before by one of the prescription drug bill's biggest detractors. This may come as a surprise to many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but it is probably an even bigger surprise to the American people who are listening to the rhetoric from the opponents of the Medicare Modernization and Prescription Drug Act.

Let me quote a section from a prescription drug bill introduced in the Senate by the minority leader, TOM DASCHLE. MR. DASCHLE's bill reads: "Noninterference. In administering the prescription drug benefit established under this part, the Secretary may not require a particular formulary or initiate a price structure for benefits; may not interfere in any way with negotiations between private entities and drug manufacturers or wholesalers; or otherwise interfere with the competitive nature of providing a prescription drug benefit through private entities."

Democrats have been blasting the ban on negotiations as a giveaway to the drug industry. Yet their Senate minority leader included in his own bill a provision with the exact same effect as the non-negotiation provision found in H.R. 1. It seems to me that the minority leader and the Democrats are not being straight with America's seniors. On the one hand, the Senate minority leader says a non-negotiation clause is

a Republican-led, taxpayer giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry; and on the other hand, he includes the very same provision in his own prescription drug bill. Plain as day, in black and white. It can be no clearer.

As a side note, Mr. Speaker, just in case my colleagues were wondering, the non-negotiation language also appeared in legislation introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), Democratic Representatives, in 2000, a bill by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) in 2000, which, by the way, 204 Democrats voted for as their floor alternative to H.R. 4680 in the previous Congress; and in the other body, Mr. Speaker, the non-interference or non-negotiation clause was used in legislation authored by Democratic Senator WYDEN in 2001 and again in the Jeffords-Breaux-Landrieu legislation in 2002.

A version of the noninterference language also appeared in the underlying Senate Medicare bill that passed the Senate June 27, 2003, by a bipartisan vote of 76 to 21. Thirty-five Democrats voted for it, a number of Senators, and I will not name their names, but a number of Democratic Senators all voted for that bill.

So why, Mr. Speaker, if this language has appeared so many times in legislation sponsored by both sides of the aisle, in both Chambers of Congress, do we continue to hear the negative rhetoric about such a great bill for our seniors? My guess, Mr. Speaker, it is just political posturing during an election year.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I did not come to the floor to speak about pre-

scription drugs, but I cannot let what the gentleman before me in the well said. He voted to prevent the Federal Government, unlike any other industrial nation on Earth, any other developed country, negotiating with the pharmaceutical industry for lower drug prices, unlike the private insurance industry, that can negotiate lower prices.

He says market forces will do better. Well, that is funny. Maybe the pharmaceutical industry would have fought against market forces. They plain and simple want to continue to gouge American consumers. The Bush administration's working day and night on this.

The Australian Free Trade Agreement prohibits the reimportation of U.S.-manufactured, FDA-approved drugs from Australia if they are cheaper than sold in the United States. They are working day and night to get Canada to agree to raise the price of FDA-approved, U.S.-manufactured drugs exported and sold in Canada at a lower price. They want the price lifted for the reimportation to the United States, and he comes to give us this little joke here after he has voted to prevent the one most effective measure we could have taken to give seniors and everyone else in this country a better deal on prescription drugs than market forces would do better. Yeah, sure.

JOB CREATION IN AMERICA

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, here is another thing that the Republicans have been talking a lot about. The President is concerned about jobs. Despite the worst job-loss record of any President since Herbert Hoover, he is really concerned. He has been appearing around the country with people and actually I kind of doubted him, but I found out yesterday in reading the Los Angeles Times that he does really care about jobs. The President really does care about creating jobs. The only problem is, he does not put any priority on where those jobs are created.

Here it is right here. Los Angeles Times, Bush supports shift of jobs overseas.

Whoa. Where is that coming from? Well, we have a few quotes to back it up. The administration's top economic adviser, "Outsourcing," i.e., moving American jobs overseas, "is just a new way of doing international trade. More things are tradeable than were tradeable in the past. And that's a good thing," says the President's own personally chosen senior economic adviser, Mr. Mankiw, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

He goes on to say, "The market is the best determinant of where the jobs should be," and that is according to Bush and Mankiw, overseas, not in the United States of America because there is cheaper labor over there.

He says here, people are concerned, maybe we will outsource a few radiologists. What does that mean? That means the false promise that was heard for years, do not worry about the industrial jobs; they are obsolete. They

say, I wonder how you are a great Nation if you do not make things. Let us accept their argument for a moment.

Then they said they would retrain American workers for those high-tech knowledge industry jobs. Radiology, that is a pretty educated job. We are going to export those. We are going to export a whole host of IT jobs. In fact, the prediction is we will export 3 million U.S. IT jobs over the next 10 years. This is the next huge hemorrhaging of U.S. jobs overseas, and what does the President think? He thinks it is a good thing because the labor is cheaper over there. It gives a better bottom line for the corporations.

What about the American workers? What are they going to do? Here are a couple of other quotes from Mr. Mankiw: "Shipping jobs to low-cost countries is the 'latest manifestation of the gains from trade.'" Shipping U.S. jobs overseas by the Bush administration is considered to be a gain from trade.

This is unbelievable, but at least they are finally being honest with us what they really believe, and they are now engaged in negotiating an expansion of NAFTA through the entire Central America, and they tell us this will be good for America. Why? Well, because the jobs would not have to travel quite as far from the United States. They would not have to go all the way to India or China. Maybe we can just export the jobs 1,000 miles down to South America so the owners of the corporations, the few managers that are left in the United States, can more easily get there to occasionally supervise their new workforce working down there in Chile or Argentina or someplace else.

That is their bottom line agenda here. They do not give a darn about American workers, American jobs, the industrial might of this country, the economic base of this country, the huge and growing trade deficit.

We are going to borrow more than \$500 billion from overseas this year because of our trade deficit. That is not sustainable. The dollar is dropping like a rock, and the Bush administration says that is a good thing because our goods will become cheaper. Guess what. We do not make much in America anymore; and if Bush has his way, we will not make anything in America anymore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LESSONS LEARNED FROM MY TRIP TO IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.